arXiv:hep-ph/9609435v1 23 Sep 1996

Glueball Masses from Hamiltonian Lattice QCD

Lian HU[a,d], Xiang-Qian LUO[a,b,c], Qi-Zhou CHEN[a,b], Xi-Yan FANG[a,b,c], and Shuo-Hong GUO[b]

[a] *CCAST (World Laboratory), Beijing 100080, China*
[b] *Department of Physics, Zhongshan University, Guangzhou 510275, China* [*]
[c] *Center for Computational Physics, Zhongshan University, Guangzhou 510275, China*
[d] *Department of Physics, South China Normal University, Guangzhou 510630, China*

Abstract

We calculate the masses of the 0^{++}, 0^{--} and 1^{+-} glueballs from QCD in 3+1 dimensions using an eigenvalue equation method for Hamiltonian lattice QCD developed and described in [4, 5, 6] by the authors. The mass ratios become approximately constants in the coupling region $6/g^2 \in [6.0, 6.4]$, from which we estimate $M(0^{--})/M(0^{++}) = 2.44 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.20$ and $M(1^{+-})/M(0^{++}) = 1.91 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.12$.

PACS number(s): 11.15.Ha, 12.38.Gc, 14.20.-c,14.40.-n

---

[*] Mailing address

1 INTRODUCTION

If QCD is the correct fundamental theory of strong interactions, a lot of glueball states should exist. These glueballs are gluonic bound states formed by strong self-interactions of gluons, and characterized by various quantum numbers J^{PC}. Precise calculation of the glueball masses will distinguish QCD from other models and give important guide for experimentalists. Among various nonperturbative techniques, lattice QCD seems to give more reliable estimates since it is model-independent.

Within lattice QCD, Monte Carlo simulation on an Euclidean lattice is still the most popular method, since in the Euclidean formulation, space-time symmetry is apparent, the particle spectrum is given by the correlation length of Green's function, and one can use the simulation methods in statistical mechanics. In fact, it can easily bridge the strong coupling region where confinement is obvious, and weak coupling region which is more physically relevant. With increasing lattice sizes, higher statistics and more suitable techniques, it might evidently give reliable predication for the glueball masses. For a review of the current status, see ref. [1].

The Hamiltonian formulation is an alternative to the standard Euclidean approach. In such a formulation, one works with a conventional quantum mechanical system, and the spectrum and wavefunction correspond to an eigenvalue and eigenstate of the Hamiltonian. Furthermore, it might possibly give new insight into the structure of the theory. Over the last twenty years, many attempts have been made. The main difficulty of some conventional methods (e.g. strong coupling expansion) is that they converge very slowly and very higher order $1/g^2$ calculations are required to extend the results to the intermediate coupling region. Unfortunately, high order calculations are difficult in practice. For some other recent and interesting developments, see [2, 3] for details.

In refs. [4, 5, 6], we proposed an efficient eigenvalue equation method for Hamiltonian lattice gauge theory. This method consists of solving order by order the eigenvalue equation with a suitable scheme preserving the correct continuum behavior at any order of approximation. So far, we have applied this method to U(1), SU(2) and SU(3) models in 2+1 dimensions and nonlinear $O(N)$ σ model in 2 dimensions. The reliability of our method is supported by increasing evidences [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11]. Most of these results have been summarized in [12, 13].

In a recent paper [14], we obtained the lightest glueball mass in QCD_3, more accurate than the previous papers [6, 11] with finite order truncation error under well control. We then used the idea of dimensional reduction [15, 16] to estimate the 0^{++} glueball mass in four dimensional QCD. Our results suggested $M(0^{++}) \approx 1.71 \pm 0.05$ Gev, in nice agreement with the most recent Monte Carlo data $M(0^{++}) \approx 1.740 \pm 0.071$ Gev by the IBM group [17]. This favors $\theta/f_J(1710)$ as a candidate of the 0^{++} glueball.

It is very desirable to do concrete computations in the realistic theory: QCD in 3+1 dimensions. In this paper, we try to make a first step towards this direction. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 2, we recapitulate the basic elements of our method. The results for the glueball masses are given in Sec. 3. In the Appendix. A, we discuss the relation between the Hamiltonian and Euclidean formulations for the purpose of comparison.

2 OUR METHOD

Our method has been described in detail in refs. [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13]. For the reader's convenience, we will repeat the most important points. The Schrödinger equation $H|\Omega\rangle = \epsilon_\Omega|\Omega\rangle$ on the Hamiltonian lattice for the ground state

$$|\Omega\rangle = exp[R(U)]|0\rangle \tag{1}$$

and vacuum energy ϵ_Ω can be reformulated as

$$\sum_l \{[E_l,[E_l,R(U)]] + [E_l,R(U)][E_l,R(U)]\}$$

$$- \frac{2}{g^4}\sum_p Tr(U_p + U_p^\dagger) = \frac{2a}{g^2}\epsilon_\Omega. \tag{2}$$

To solve this equation, let us express $R(U)$ in order of independent set of gauge invariant operators $G_{n,i}$, i.e., $R(U) = \sum_n R_n(U) =$

$\sum_{n,i} C_{n,i} G_{n,i}(U)$. Substituting it to (2), we have the Nth order truncated eigenvalue equation [4, 5]

$$\sum_l \{[E_l, [E_l, \sum_n^N R_n(U)]] + \sum_{n_1+n_2 \le N} [E_l, R_{n_1}(U)][E_l, R_{n_2}(U)]\}$$

$$- \frac{4}{g^4} \sum_p ReTr(U_p) = \frac{2a}{g^2} \epsilon_\Omega. \tag{3}$$

Since the higher order graphs are created by the second term in (3), at Nth order approximation all contributions from this term with $n_1 + n_2 > N$ should be discarded. The reason for such a truncation method is to maintain the correct continuum behavior during the truncation, as explained in detail in ref. [4]. By taking the coefficients of the graphs $G_{n,i}$ in this equation to zero, we obtain a set of non-linear algebraic equations, from which $C_{n,i}$ are determined. Therefore, solving lattice field theory is reduced to solving the algebraic equations. Similarly, the eigenvalue equation $H|F\rangle = \epsilon_F|F\rangle$ for the glueball mass $M(J^{PC}) = \Delta\epsilon = \epsilon_F - \epsilon_\Omega$ and its wave function [6]

$$|F\rangle = [F(U) - \frac{\langle\Omega|F(U)|\Omega\rangle}{\langle\Omega|\Omega\rangle}]|\Omega\rangle \tag{4}$$

at order N is

$$\sum_l \{[E_l, [E_l, \sum_n^N F_n(U)]] + 2 \sum_{n_1+n_2 \le N} [E_l, F_{n_1}(U)][E_l, R_{n_2}(U)]\}$$

$$= \frac{2a\Delta\epsilon}{g^2} \sum_n^N F_n(U), \tag{5}$$

from which the coefficients $f_{n,i}$ in the glueball operator $F(U) = \sum_n F_n(U) = \sum_{n,i} f_{n,i} G_{n,i}^{J^{PC}}$ are determined. According to our experiences, it is hopeful that the results converge rapidly to some stable value. The difference between the results from different truncation orders is our estimate for the systematic error.

Other detailed techniques, like the choice of independent set of operators in $SU(3)$ and efficient ways to improve the continuum behavior of the physical quantities, can be found in refs. [5, 6, 11].

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Since this work is our first attempt to apply the method above to 3+1 dimensional pure QCD, we would like to compute the masses of glueballs with gluonic operators easily constructed. Here we choose three glueballs 0^{++}, 0^{--}, and 1^{+-}. Some lowest order gluonic operators are plotted in Fig. 1. The operators R_n and F_n are linear combinations of these graphs, and the first order ones are

$$R_1 = C_1(G_{1,1}^{(1)} + G_{1,1}^{(2)} + G_{1,1}^{(3)}) + h.c.,$$

$$F_1^{1^{+-}} = f_1^{1^{+-}}(G_{1,1}^{(3)} - h.c.). \tag{6}$$

Since the 0^{++} glueball has symmetry the same as the vacuum, we take $F_1^{0^{++}} = R_1$. Once the lowest order graphs are determined, the higher order graphs are generated by the second term in (3) for R_n or that in (5) for F_n, from which an independent set is chosen, taking into account the uni-modular conditions. The operators so generated are certainly of the symmetry of the corresponding glueballs. For example, at the $2nd$ order

$$F_2^{0^{++}} = f_{2,1}^{0^{++}}(G_{2,1}^{(1)} + G_{2,1}^{(2)} + G_{2,1}^{(3)}) + f_{2,2}^{0^{++}}(G_{2,2}^{(1)} + G_{2,2}^{(2)} + G_{2,2}^{(3)})$$

$$+ f_{2,3}^{0^{++}}(G_{2,3}^{(1)} + G_{2,3}^{(2)} + G_{2,3}^{(3)})$$

$$+ f_{2,4}^{0^{++}}(G_{2,4}^{(1)} + G_{2,4}^{(2)} + G_{2,4}^{(3)}) + f_{2,5}^{0^{++}}(G_{2,5}^{(1)} + G_{2,5}^{(2)} + G_{2,5}^{(3)})$$

$$+ f_{2,6}^{0^{++}}(G_{2,6}^{(1)} + G_{2,6}^{(2)} + G_{2,6}^{(3)})$$

$$+ f_{2,7}^{0^{++}}(G_{2,7}^{(1)} + G_{2,7}^{(2)} + G_{2,7}^{(3)} + G_{2,7}^{(4)} + G_{2,7}^{(5)} + G_{2,7}^{(6)} + G_{2,7}^{(7)} + G_{2,7}^{(8)} + G_{2,7}^{(9)}$$

$$+ G_{2,7}^{(10)} + G_{2,7}^{(11)} + G_{2,7}^{(12)})$$

$$+ f_{2,8}^{0^{++}}(G_{2,8}^{(1)} + G_{2,8}^{(2)} + G_{2,8}^{(3)} + G_{2,8}^{(4)} + G_{2,8}^{(5)} + G_{2,8}^{(6)} + G_{2,8}^{(7)} + G_{2,8}^{(8)} + G_{2,8}^{(9)}$$

$$+G_{2,8}^{(10)}+G_{2,8}^{(11)}+G_{2,8}^{(12)})$$

$$+f_{2,9}^{0^{++}}(G_{2,9}^{(1)}+G_{2,9}^{(2)}+G_{2,9}^{(3)}+G_{2,9}^{(4)}+G_{2,9}^{(5)}+G_{2,9}^{(6)}+G_{2,9}^{(7)}+G_{2,9}^{(8)}+G_{2,9}^{(9)}+G_{2,9}^{(10)}$$

$$+G_{2,9}^{(11)}+G_{2,9}^{(12)})$$

$$+f_{2,10}^{0^{++}}(G_{2,10}^{(1)}+G_{2,10}^{(2)}+G_{2,10}^{(3)}+G_{2,10}^{(4)}+G_{2,10}^{(5)}+G_{2,10}^{(6)}$$

$$+G_{2,10}^{(7)}+G_{2,10}^{(8)}+G_{2,10}^{(9)}+G_{2,10}^{(10)}+G_{2,10}^{(11)}+G_{2,10}^{(12)})+h.c.$$

$$F_2^{0^{--}}=f_{2,7}^{0^{--}}(G_{2,7}^{(1)}+G_{2,7}^{(2)}+G_{2,7}^{(3)}+G_{2,7}^{(4)}+G_{2,7}^{(5)}+G_{2,7}^{(6)}$$

$$+G_{2,7}^{(7)}+G_{2,7}^{(8)}+G_{2,7}^{(9)}+G_{2,7}^{(10)}+G_{2,7}^{(11)}+G_{2,7}^{(12)})$$

$$+f_{2,8}^{0^{--}}(G_{2,8}^{(1)}+G_{2,8}^{(2)}+G_{2,8}^{(3)}+G_{2,8}^{(4)}+G_{2,8}^{(5)}+G_{2,8}^{(6)}+G_{2,8}^{(7)}+G_{2,8}^{(8)}+G_{2,8}^{(9)}$$

$$+G_{2,8}^{(10)}+G_{2,8}^{(11)}+G_{2,8}^{(12)})$$

$$+f_{2,9}^{0^{--}}(G_{2,9}^{(1)}+G_{2,9}^{(2)}+G_{2,9}^{(3)}+G_{2,9}^{(4)}+G_{2,9}^{(5)}+G_{2,9}^{(6)}+G_{2,9}^{(7)}+G_{2,9}^{(8)}+G_{2,9}^{(9)}$$

$$+G_{2,9}^{(10)}+G_{2,9}^{(11)}+G_{2,9}^{(12)})$$

$$+f_{2,10}^{0^{--}}(G_{2,10}^{(1)}+G_{2,10}^{(2)}+G_{2,10}^{(3)}+G_{2,10}^{(4)}+G_{2,10}^{(5)}+G_{2,10}^{(6)}$$

$$+G_{2,10}^{(7)}+G_{2,10}^{(8)}+G_{2,10}^{(9)}+G_{2,10}^{(10)}+G_{2,10}^{(11)}+G_{2,10}^{(12)})-h.c.$$

$$F_2^{1^{+-}}=f_{2,1}^{1^{+-}}G_{2,1}^{(3)}+f_{2,3}^{1^{+-}}G_{2,3}^{(3)}+f_{2,4}^{1^{+-}}G_{2,4}^{(3)}$$

$$+f_{2,7}^{1^{+-}}(G_{2,7}^{(5)}+G_{2,7}^{(6)}+G_{2,7}^{(7)}+G_{2,7}^{(8)}+G_{2,7}^{(9)}+G_{2,7}^{(10)}+G_{2,7}^{(11)}+G_{2,7}^{(12)})$$

$$+f_{2,8}^{1^{+-}}(G_{2,8}^{(5)}+G_{2,8}^{(6)}+G_{2,8}^{(7)}+G_{2,8}^{(8)}+G_{2,8}^{(9)}+G_{2,8}^{(10)}+G_{2,8}^{(11)}+G_{2,8}^{(12)})$$

$$+f_{2,9}^{1^{+-}}(G_{2,9}^{(5)}+G_{2,9}^{(6)}+G_{2,9}^{(7)}+G_{2,9}^{(8)}+G_{2,9}^{(9)}+G_{2,9}^{(10)}+G_{2,9}^{(11)}+G_{2,9}^{(12)})$$

$$+f_{2,10}^{1^{+-}}(G_{2,10}^{(5)}+G_{2,10}^{(6)}+G_{2,10}^{(7)}+G_{2,10}^{(8)}+G_{2,10}^{(9)}+G_{2,10}^{(10)}+G_{2,10}^{(11)}+G_{2,10}^{(12)})$$

$$-\,h.c. \tag{7}$$

Higher order graphs can be calculated in a similar way.

At relatively strong coupling, the absolute value of aM_E, calculated in the Hamiltonian formulation and converted to the Euclidean one using (18), differs from the result from strong coupling expansion in the Euclidean formulation. This is not surprising because the Hamiltonian and Euclidean formulations are different schemes at finite lattice spacing, and the weak coupling relation (18) doesn't not hold in the strong coupling region. For $\beta \geq 6.0$, we do observe that the difference in aM_E becomes much smaller at weaker coupling and there is a tendency approaching the Monte Carlo data [1].

Similar to the most recent Monte Carlo data [1] in the available coupling region, clear asymptotic scaling window for the individual mass $aM(0^{++})$, $aM(0^{--})$, or $aM(1^{+-})$ could not be found. There might be two possible reasons for this scaling violation: the available coupling region being not weak enough for the asymptotic scaling relation between a and β_E to be valid or the results being not accurate enough. The first one may be reduced by the Symazik's improvement or Lepage-Mackenzie scheme. The second one may also be improved by higher order calculations. For the mass ratio $M_E^{(1)}/M_E^{(2)}$, the large part of errors in $M_E^{(1)}$ and $M_E^{(2)}$ are canceled. Indeed, we observe approximate plateau for the mass ratio both for $M(0^{--})/M(0^{++})$ and $M(1^{+-})/M(0^{++})$ in the coupling region $\beta \in [6.0, 6.4]$, which are shown in Fig. 2.

From the plateaus in $\beta \in [6.0, 6.4]$, we estimate

$$\frac{M(0^{--})}{M(0^{++})} = 2.44 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.20$$

$$\frac{M(1^{+-})}{M(0^{++})} = 1.91 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.12, \tag{8}$$

where the mean value is the averaged one over the data in this region, the first error is the error of the data in the plateau, and the second error is the upper limit of the systematic errors due to the finite order truncation.

For comparison, we list corresponding results from other lattice calculations: For $M(0^{--})/M(0^{++})$, it is approximately 3.43 ± 1.50 from Monte Carlo simulations (see the references in [1]), 2.2 ± 0.2 from t-expansion plus Padé approximants [19]. For $M(1^{+-})/M(0^{++})$, it is 1.88 ± 0.02 from Monte Carlo, and 1.60 ± 0.60 from t-expansion plus Padé. For $M(0^{--})/M(0^{++})$, we obtain a value between the Monte Carlo and t-expansion data, with error under better control than the former one. For the $M(1^{+-})/M(0^{++})$, where the systematic error in the Monte Carlo data is very small, we get a value consistent well with the Monte Carlo data.

In conclusion, we have done spectrum computations of the 0^{++}, 0^{--} and 1^{+-} glueballs, by means of the eigenvalue equation method in [4, 5, 6]. Our first results for 3+1 dimensional QCD from this method are encouraging. The spectrum calculations of other glueballs, such as 2^{++}, 0^{-+} and 0^{+-}, are in progress.

Acknowledgments

We thank T. Huang, J.M. Liu, C. Morningstar, D. Schütte, X.Y. Shen, J.M. Wu and some members of the BES collaboration for useful communications. This work was supported by the project of National Natural Science Foundation, and that of Chinese Education Committee.

A EUCLIDEAN AND HAMILTONIAN FORMULATIONS

The standard Yang-Mills action is

$$S = -\frac{1}{4}\int d^4x \mathcal{F}^{\alpha}_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{F}^{\alpha}_{\mu\nu}. \tag{9}$$

On the Euclidean lattice, the standard Wilson action is

$$S = -\frac{\beta_E}{2N_c}\sum_p Tr(U_p + U_p^{\dagger} - 2), \tag{10}$$

where β_E is related to the number of color N_c and the bare coupling g_E by $\beta_E = 2N_c/g_E^2$, and $U_p \equiv U_{\mu\nu}$ is the product of four link variables around an elementary plaquette in the μ and ν directions. In the continuum limit $\beta_E \to \infty$, it reduces to the Yang-Mills action (9).

To derive the lattice Hamiltonian from (10), let us fix the lattice spacing $a_s = a$ in spatial directions and decrease the lattice spacing a_t in the temporal direction so that $\xi \equiv a/a_t \to \infty$. In this case, (10) becomes

$$S = -\frac{\beta_t}{2N_c}\sum_i Tr(U_{it} + h.c. - 2) - \frac{\beta_s}{2N_c}\sum_{i>j} Tr(U_{ij} + h.c. - 2). \tag{11}$$

Quantum-mechanically,

$$\beta_t = \frac{2N_c}{g_t^2}, \quad \beta_s = \frac{2N_c}{g_s^2} \tag{12}$$

where $g_t \neq g_s$ due to the ξ factor and quantum effects. They are related to the Euclidean coupling by

$$\frac{1}{g_t^2} = \frac{1}{g_E^2} + c_t + O(g_E^2), \quad \frac{1}{g_s^2} = \frac{1}{g_E^2} + c_s + O(g_E^2) \tag{13}$$

if g_E is small enough. The coefficients are calculated in [18]:

$$c_t = 4N_c[-0.01631 + \frac{1}{32N_c^2}], \quad c_s = 4N_c[0.01707 - \frac{0.59173}{32N_c^2}]. \tag{14}$$

Using the transfer matrix or Legendre transformation methods, one can show that the lattice Hamiltonian in the temporal gauge is

$$H = \frac{g_t}{g_s} H_{KS}, \tag{15}$$

where

$$H_{KS} = \frac{g_H^2}{2a} \sum_{x,j} E_j^\alpha(x) E_j^\alpha(x) - \frac{1}{a g_H^2} \sum_p Tr(U_p + U_p^\dagger - 2). \tag{16}$$

is the Kogut-Susskind Hamiltonian and

$$g_H = \sqrt{g_t g_s} \tag{17}$$

is the gauge coupling of the Kogut-Susskind Hamiltonian gauge theory. In (16), the summation $\sum_{x,j}$ is over the link l in the positive spatial directions, and the summation $\sum_p$ is over the spatial elementary plaquette. For weak enough coupling $g_E \to 0$, the mass can be compared with the Euclidean one

$$M_E = M_H \frac{g_t}{g_s} \tag{18}$$

if g_H is converted to g_E by (17). The g_t/g_s factor doesn't matter if one calculates the mass ratio.

References

[1] D. Weingarten, Nucl. Phys. **B(Proc. Suppl.)34** (1993) 29, and references therein.

[2] C. Hamer, M. Sheppeard, W. ZHENG and D. Schütte, hep-th/9511179.

[3] C. Hamer, W. ZHENG and D. Schütte, hep-lat/9603026, and references therein.

[4] S.H. GUO, Q.Z. CHEN, and L. LI, Phys. Rev. D**49** (1994) 507.

[5] Q.Z. CHEN, X.Q. LUO, and S.H. GUO, Phys. Lett. B**341** (1995) 349.

[6] Q.Z. CHEN, X.Q. LUO, S.H. GUO and X.Y. FANG, Phys. Lett. **B348** (1995) 560.

[7] Q.Z. CHEN, S.H. GUO, W.H. ZHENG, and X.Y. FANG, Phys. Rev. D**50** (1994) 3564.

[8] X.Y. FANG, J.M. LIU and S.H. GUO, Phys. Rev. **D53** (1996).

[9] S.H. GUO, Q.Z. CHEN, X.Y. FANG and R.C. CHEN, Zhongshan University Preprint (1995).

[10] S.H. GUO et al., Zhongshan University Preprint (1996).

[11] X.Q. LUO, Q.Z. CHEN, P.F. CAI and S.H. GUO, Zhongshan University Preprint (1996).

[12] S.H. GUO, Q.Z. CHEN, X.Y. FANG, J.M. LIU, X.Q. LUO and W.H. ZHENG, Nucl. Phys. **B(Proc. Suppl.)47** (1996) 827.

[13] Q. CHEN, S. GUO, X.Q. LUO and A. SEGUI, Nucl. Phys. **B(Proc. Suppl.)47** (1996) 274.

[14] X.Q. LUO and Q.Z. CHEN, hep-ph/9604395.

[15] J. Greensite, Nucl. Phys. B**166** (1980) 113.

[16] S. Samuel, CCNY-HEP-96/3.

[17] J. Sexton, A. Vaccarino, and D. Weingarten, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75** (1995) 4563.

[18] A. Hasenfrantz and P. Hasenfratz, Nucl. Phys. **B193** (1981) 210.

[19] C. van den Doel and D. Horn, Phys. Phys. **D35** (1987) 2824.

Figure Captions

Fig.1 Some relevant gluonic operators at the lowest orders.

Fig. 2 Mass ratios of the glueballs.

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9609435v1

This figure "fig2-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9609435v1

This figure "fig1-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9609435v1

This figure "fig2-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9609435v1

This figure "fig1-3.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9609435v1